DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 662 UD 028 924

TITLE	Mainstreaming the Urban Poor. Enabling Non-Public Schools To Survive in Inner-City Neighborhoods.
INSTITUTION	Institute of Urban Life, Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	Lloyd A. Fry Foundation, Chicago, IL.
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	47p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Institute of Urban Life, One East Superior Street, Chicago, IL 60611 ($5).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Economically Disadvantaged; Economic Factors; Educational Finance; Elementary Education; Elementary Schools; Fund Raising; Guidelines; *Inner City; Minority Group Children; Parent Participation; Poverty; *Private Schools; *School Role; State Aid; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois (Chicago); *Mainstreaming the Disadvantaged

ABSTRACT

This publication considers the role of urban, non-public elementary schools, particularly in Chicago (Illinois), in breaking the cycle of inner city poverty and also offers information and guidance on how to support and strengthen such schools. Following an introduction, the first section details the proliferation of such small, non-public schools serving the inner-city poor and their vulnerability to financial and other pressures. The next section discusses nine indicators of school viability including such things as distinctive mission, alert and effective principals, and flexibility for the changing needs of the community. A third section considers the cultivation of other private resources including information from studies on this topic and details of organizations and foundations that support non-public schools. Another section looks at aid available from federal and state sources, noting that funds are sporadic and difficult to obtain. A final section suggests issues for the future. Appendixes contain information on resources from the Illinois State Board of Education and a reproduction of an article, "How To Get Money, Services for Your School" (Susan Klonsky). (Contains 78 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 662

UD

Mainstreaming the Urban Poor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ed. Marciniak
Institute for Urban Life
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Enabling Non-Public Schools to Survive in Inner-City Neighborhoods

A Report from the
Institute of Urban Life
Loyola University Chicago
1992

ED 366 624

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mainstreaming the Urban Poor

Enabling Non-Public Schools
to Survive in
Inner-City Neighborhoods

A Report from the
Institute of Urban Life
Loyola University Chicago
1992

Contents

	Introduction	5
I.	Mainstreaming the Urban Poor	7
II.	Enabling a Non-Public School's Future: Indicators of Viability	9
III.	Cultivating Other Private Resources	15
IV.	Government Aid: A 'Mixed Bag'	23
V.	Looking Ahead	30
	Notes and Sources	32
	Appendices:	
	A. The Illinois State Board of Education and resources for students in non-public schools.	37
	B. "How to get money, service for your school."	47

The research for this report was made possible by a grant from the Lloyd A. Fry Foundation.

Printing was provided by a grant from
REFCO, Inc.
111 West Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60604

Additional copies may be obtained from the
Institute of Urban Life
One East Superior Street
Chicago, IL 60611

Introduction

In recent years the print media, nationally and here in Chicago, have saluted the educational achievements of non-public elementary and secondary schools in inner-city neighborhoods. Nearly one of every four of Chicago's elementary and secondary students attends a non-public school. Were these 125,000 students to transfer into the Chicago Public Schools, the Chicago Board of Education's annual tax levy would rise by an estimated half billion dollars.

In the past, the public's image of Chicago's non-public schools has been shaped largely by the presence of well-established and nationally known private schools such as Harvard School, St. Ignatius College Prep, Mount Carmel High School, Ancona School, DeLaSalle Institute, Hardey Preparatory School for Boys, Morgan Park Academy, University of Chicago Laboratory Schools, and others. Such private schools, however, constitute a minority, less than 10 percent of Chicago's 450 private schools.

In the 1990s, the clamor for public school reform has called attention to the more typical non-public elementary school: a neighborhood-based institution, usually with a religious affiliation. It is smaller in size than the local public school, often enrolling only two or three hundred students. These 400 or so schools are scattered throughout Chicago. Every neighborhood has at least one. Their religious, ethnic, economic, and cultural diversity is notable. In the city's lowest-income neighborhoods, most of the church-related schools are predominantly black or Hispanic in enrollment. Often, the majority of the black parents belongs to a religious denomination other than the one sponsoring the school. Finally, many of the parents are not connected to any church.

A major goal of the Institute of Urban Life is to strengthen the capacity of these neighborhood-based schools to survive and thrive in an inner-city environment where the majority of pupils come from low-income families. This report, therefore, identifies approaches and resources that might be used to improve and bolster these private schools. Some questions that prompted this guidebook of educational strategies and resources were:

- How can an inner-city private school better organize itself as a not-for-profit institution that will survive into the 21st century?
- What organizations, other than the schools themselves, provide scholarships or financial aid to enable youngsters from inner-city neighborhoods to enroll in private schools?
- What aid or services does the government (city, county, state, or federal government) offer non-public schools?
- What kinds of technical assistance are available for board development, marketing, budgeting, improving record-keeping systems and administration, or setting up fund-raising campaigns?
- Which employers in the metropolitan area match the contributions made by their employees to private elementary and secondary schools?

Mainstreaming the Urban Poor: Enabling Non-Public Schools to Survive in Inner-City Neighborhoods is a sequel to two earlier reports. The first, Educational Choice: A Catalyst for School Reform, was prepared for the Task Force on Education of the City Club of Chicago. The second report, published by the Institute of Urban Life, focused on Chicago's Private Elementary and Secondary Schools: Enrollment Trends. The purpose of both reports was to raise public

consciousness about the contribution of non-public schools to the city's well-being and about their important role in mainstreaming the urban poor.

The Institute's purpose is to help leaders of non-public schools take the additional steps that would empower their institutions to continue educating children from low-income families and escorting them into the urban mainstream. While high school leaders may benefit from this inventory of resources and strategies, our special concern is the survival of struggling non-public elementary schools in Chicago's inner-city neighborhoods. At this level, many youngsters can be reached before they become hopelessly entangled with gangs, drugs, street crime, violence, patterns of absenteeism, and dropping out.

A special word of appreciation is due Bettie De Young and Jeannine Jung who were the research assistants.

Ed Marciniak, President
Institute of Urban Life
Loyola University Chicago

I. Mainstreaming the Urban Poor

What more can be done to ensure the survival—and growth—of the excellent non-public elementary and secondary schools that serve children in Chicago's inner-city neighborhoods and in its low-income suburbs? These neighborhood-based schools are supported by families who prefer a non-public school for their children or by parents who want an alternative when they become dissatisfied with the local public school to which their youngster is assigned. The availability and the quality of these private schools often energize low-income parents to scrimp and save so that their children can be enrolled. Why? Because these schools have demonstrated a talent for nurturing and educating youngsters from backgrounds of grinding poverty. A non-public school, according to the U. S. Department of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics, is:

> A school established by an individual, institution, or agency other than the state, subdivisions of the state, or the Federal government, which usually is supported primarily by other than public funds, and the operation of whose program rests with other than publicly elected or appointed officials.

In this report "non-public" and "private" are used interchangeably.

Experience has shown that a public housing family sending its children to a private school, has often taken the first step that will eventually lead it to an apartment in the private housing market. (1) This parental initiative, taken at great personal sacrifice, usually expedites the family's entry into the urban mainstream. That parental choice is then rewarded and reinforced when parents realize that their child is, in fact, making educational progress in a school climate more hospitable to their ethnic, cultural, and religious backgrounds. Studies indicate that the longer the child remains in such a private school, the better he or she does academically. (2) When parents become aware of this educational advancement, they are motivated to climb out of poverty so that they can continue to send their child to a non-public school.

In low-income neighborhoods, the future of non-public schools is often in jeopardy because they are caught in the crunch between escalating costs that lead to higher tuition and ever fewer families who can afford to pay that tuition. A minimal tuition fee that most parents can barely afford is insufficient to pay the actual costs of operating the school. Each hike in tuition, therefore, quickly reaches a threshold of diminishing returns by excluding more and more families, thus swelling the deficit.

Where is this dilemma most evident? In elementary schools, usually under religious sponsorship, which serve children residing in Chicago's areas of abiding poverty, such as those dominated by giant, high-rise public housing projects. At St. Joseph School across the street from the Cabrini-Green housing project, the tuition per family is $855 a year. But the actual cost per student is $1,900 annually. The resulting deficit is real and burdensome. At Holy Family Lutheran School 30 of its 100 students come from the Cabrini-Green public housing project; parents pay between $500 to $775 a year per student. The balance of the overall school costs, approximately $250,000 annually, is underwritten by scholarship donors and other fund-raising activities. At St. Gregory Episcopal School on the city's Near West Side, the tuition is $500 a year per student. Forty percent of its students live in public housing projects. The school's annual fund-raising goal approaches $200,000. Schools such as these have formed a partnership with the urban poor.

These three schools and similar ones are fragile institutions, generally operating on shoestring budgets. They compete for teachers who could earn much higher salaries in the public sector. They strive to keep tuition down so that

children from lower-income families are not excluded. These schools are unable to accumulate reserves; yet they must cope with aging buildings and deferred maintenance. For their survival, these schools depend upon a precarious combination of low tuition, underpaid staff, dogged leadership, low overhead, dedicated volunteers, scholarships, subsidies, and a reputation for giving a good education while maintaining discipline and safety (no gangs, drugs, or violence) and transmitting shared values. Their frailty is publicly exposed each time the media report that another private school has shut its doors for the last time.

These private elementary schools are an endangered species. Yet while they may be risk-prone institutions, their vitality and optimism are amazing. During the last five years, for each neighborhood-based private school that closed its doors in Chicago, a new one opened elsewhere in the city. Furthermore, the new school is usually under religious auspices and situated in inner-city environs.

It is not our intention to slight high schools. Most of the suggestions and strategic steps recommended in this report have consequences and benefits for both elementary and secondary schools. Because of their size, most private high schools can rely on a broader community base, higher tuition, more active alumni, bigger budgets, and larger back-up staff. The fact that many high schools are sponsored by religious communities of women or men is a source of undeniable strength. (In some cases, however, that kind of patronage, subordinated to a religious community's own priorities and problems, has led to a high school's demise.)

In corporate and foundation giving to individual institutions, private high schools have a clear edge, historically and pragmatically, over elementary schools—in part, because there are many more of the latter. Donors seek ways to avoid dealing with hundreds of requests for support. This fact helps explain the reasons for the success of efforts at consolidated fund-raising, like the Big Shoulders Fund which supports Catholic schools, mostly elementary, in the inner-city neighborhoods of Chicago. (3) Furthermore, most private high schools, unlike most elementary schools, have been able to staff a development office to raise the additional funds necessary for the school's fiscal stability and for enriching its curriculum. In Chicago, the day-to-day activities of Catholic high schools are also enhanced by collaboration among their administrative professionals. There is, for example, the Catholic Association of School Business Administrators, the Archdiocesan Development Council, and the Northwest Side Recruiters. (4)

Many reasons can be offered for giving priority to private elementary schools that serve poverty-congested areas. But the most important reason, by far, is that such schools intervene early to help break the cycle of inner-city poverty. They start to work with students who, if attending a public school, might become dropouts in the upper grades or high school. Such schools ease the entrance of children—and their parents—into the urban mainstream.

II. Enabling a Non-Public School's Future: Indicators of Viability

Why do some private schools in the city's poorest neighborhoods carry on while others flounder? The surviving schools have been nourished by a network of volunteers and a stream of dollars that arrive via a religious connection: a sponsoring parish, a "sharing" or "urban linkage" program with another parish (congregation), or a city-wide fund organized to support such schools. (1) Through this partnership arrangement where a city or suburban parish (congregation) is linked, for example, with an inner-city one, much more may be shared than the money raised from a special Sunday collection. Scholarships, home visitations, joint liturgies, summer picnics, choir exchanges, materials, equipment, employment opportunities, new friendships, or volunteer tutors can also become part of the crosstown exchange. At Blessed Sacrament school in the Chicago Lawndale area, any graduate can get a partial scholarship for a Catholic high school from St. Luke, a sharing parish in River Forest.

Since tuition in most cases covers but a portion of the school's educational costs, such church-related resources enable schools to keep their doors open. When this funding source shrinks, as it sometimes does, the school is in peril. But the availability of financial backing sometimes does not tell the whole story. Other factors, some equally as important as money, also help explain survival. At least nine indicators of the viability of a non-public school can now be identified.

1. The non-public school in an inner-city neighborhood is recognized for its distinctive and sharply defined mission—social and/or religious. The faculty shares in it. Parents love it. And students enjoy the orderly and safe environment in which learning proceeds. A school with a clear identity and a common purpose generates the community support and pride that can help underwrite its future. What Richard Zoglin of Time magazine observed about Catholic schools applies to other church-supported schools in impoverished neighborhoods:

> The real secret is how these schools have been able to do more for less . . . . How do the . . . schools do it? Mostly by practicing and preaching old-fashioned stuff: values, discipline, educational rigor and parental accountability, coupled with minimal bureaucracy. (2)

That is why so many non-public schools, for example, make it a practice to telephone a child's parent or guardian early in the morning on any day that the child does not show up for class.

2. The school is governed by a board of directors on whose shoulders falls responsibility for the school's future, which sets policy, and which hires the principal (headmistress or headmaster). School boards which are merely advisory, on the other hand, are neat and noble-sounding entities but, in practice, usually inadequate and, sometimes, counterproductive in an inner-city neighborhood. Their well-meaning involvement can contribute to the overwork and "burn-out" of a principal or a pastor. Advisors tend to add to the activity load of the principal without shouldering their share of the responsibility for the school's well-being. A religiously-affiliated school can be put at risk when a pastor, whatever the denomination, hesitates to entrust responsibility to parents and others equally concerned about the school's viability. At a National Congress on Catholic Schools held in 1991, a Texas businessman, using a biblical metaphor, noted that:

> traditionally the pastors have carried much of the responsibility, and they have been reluctant to delegate the responsibility, reluctant to change traditions . . . . But the pastor must realize that he's not the owner of the sheep but the shepherd.

Nine Indicators of A School's Viability

1. The non-public school in an inner-city neighborhood is recognized for its distinctive and sharply defined mission—social and/or religious.

2. The school is governed by a board of directors on whose shoulders falls responsibility for the school's future, which sets policy and which hires the principal (headmistress or headmaster).

3. The school enjoys the presence of a chief executive officer, a headmaster (headmistress), a principal or other leader who is more than a head teacher or instructional arbiter.

4. The school's leadership recognizes the importance of turning donors into active partners in promoting the school and trumpeting its strengths.

5. Alert school executives anticipate the likelihood of high transiency among students.

6. Those accountable for a school's future are willing to change, ready to adapt to the special needs of the neighborhood.

7. While the school may receive substantial grants from the local parish or the denominational headquarters downtown, its leadership does not become stuck in the rut of dependency.

8. Private schools have enjoyed amazing success in recruiting part-time volunteers.

9. Experienced leaders of non-public schools are in a realistic position to appraise the usefulness of technical assistance from outside providers.

A pastor who acts as if he "owns" the school or parish almost always becomes an incompetent administrator. This tendency strengthens the case for an active, broad-based school board that will oversee a private elementary school, particularly in a poverty-stricken neighborhood.

3. The school enjoys the presence of a chief executive officer, a headmaster (headmistress), a principal or other leader who is more than a head teacher or instructional arbiter. Whether that person works in the rectory or the school, there is never any doubt about where the buck stops. It is she or he who first confronts, and then responds, to new circumstances, such as a demographic change in the school's neighborhood, the need for dedicated teachers and board members, or the upkeep of a school building whose boiler may have survived the Great Chicago Fire of 1871. Private elementary schools are usually not led by such a person as is the case in many private secondary schools. Without the presence of an active, dedicated leader who assumes the mantle of responsibility for the school's success or failure, whatever that person's title may be, the school risks an uncertain future.

4. The school's leadership recognizes the importance of turning donors into active partners in promoting the school and trumpeting its strengths. Church-affiliated schools in low-income areas are bolstered by a triad of social capital: neighborhood, parish (congregation), and school. How shortsighted it is to "use" people solely for their money! Women and men blessed with treasure may also be graced with time and talent to devote to the school's future. Modestly well-to-do people will give, but are they ever invited to give of their work and wisdom? To share their network of relationships and contacts? If they are, the school may then evolve into an influential and nurturing community on a rocky road to success. Some donors can enhance a school as members of its board of directors which determines the educational policy, reaches out to the community, and grapples with unexpected crises. Other donors may not have additional dollars to give but may do building repairs, paint walls, serve as classroom and lunchroom aides, staff telephone trees, edit newsletters, run errands, keep in touch with the alumni, supervise athletic programs, serve on committees, or undertake a hundred-and-one other assignments.

5. Alert school executives anticipate the likelihood of high transiency among students. Educational professionals, as a rule, are products of teacher training institutions which provide little sense of neighborhood and which assume that a school's population is more or less stable and that student turnover is minimal. However, at elementary schools situated in areas of high poverty, transfers out may be signs of student progress and family accomplishment. Is it not also the aim of such schools to help students and their families accelerate their movement into the urban mainstream? Whenever such a school helps erect bridges between an apartment in public housing to one in a privately owned building in another neighborhood, that transition should be seen as progress—as much as a student's higher test score. These achievements, however, are seldom measured.

Furthermore, educational professionals in non-public schools have not been trained to handle enrollment predictions. An unexpected drop or increase of 50 students in the first week of September is devastating in a smaller school. Suddenly, teachers must be hired or let go. In such schools, enrollment drives the budget, staff, materials, and classroom or instructional organization. Standard methods of predicting pupil counts are inadequate in urban areas of poverty. In some schools, to avoid enrollment surprises in September, parents are urged to register in the preceding May and given incentives, economic and other, to do so.

6. Those accountable for a school's future are willing to change, ready to adapt to the special needs of the neighborhood. To stop the hemorrhaging of enrollment, many schools have responded to family and neighborhood needs

for child care beyond the K to 8 grades. Nowhere is this success more evident than in the re-making of traditional K to 8 classrooms. Preschool programs have multiplied. Those without a kindergarten have added one. Hundreds of Chicago's private schools now welcome latchkey students by offering them activities before and after school, day care even on school holidays, or summer day camp and enrichment programs. As the number of single-parent or two-earner families multiplies, could it be that the future of private schools lies in being open and in service all day, five days a week, and during the summer? For many neighborhood schools, there is no alternative. For them, an 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. school is a cultural anachronism. That is why many of these schools now enroll students who live at a distance far enough to be driven to and from school each day.

Dr. Robert Kealey, formerly executive director of the elementary schools department of the National Catholic Educational Association, reported in 1991 that Catholic school enrollment nationwide had risen dramatically in preschool programs (up 187 percent since 1982) and in extended-day programs (up 16 percent). Extended-day programs serve the school's children outside the regular school day, before and after school, or when school is not in session. A day-care provider may assume responsibility for preschool children as young as six-months old. More than 30 percent of the nation's 7,000 Catholic elementary schools now provide extended-day programs. For nearly a decade, Kealey has been in the forefront, promoting day care and extended-day programs as a way of easing financial and child care woes and boosting enrollments. (3)

7. While the school may receive substantial grants from the local parish or the denominational headquarters downtown, its leadership does not become stuck in the rut of dependency. Such an educational investment is both an asset and a liability. Hence, effective school leaders shun the complacency that leads them to expect the subsidy to continue forever and that lulls them into doing little or nothing to make the school more self-supporting. The leaders of a thriving school are not laid-back but are entrepreneurial. They search for new sources of revenue to pay teachers a just wage, for new volunteers to help improve student performance, and for new friends to reduce the annual deficit. Their leadership is inventive and self-starting.

Four examples of such enterprise are the following: (a) In one elementary school where some classrooms were only half full, incentives were offered to school families to recruit new students. Parents were given the chance to cut their child's tuition bill in half for one year by persuading another parent to enroll a new tuition-paying student or, to eliminate their tuition altogether, by bringing in two new pupils. Thus, empty school seats were occupied, and income started to rise, while expenses were not increased significantly. (b) In most successful inner-city schools, full financial aid is seldom given to a student. All parents pay something. Why? To spark further parental involvement and to set an example of self-reliance for the young student. In school parlance, scholarships are normally awarded to academically gifted students, while financial aid goes to those short of funds, whether high achievers or not. (In this report scholarships and financial aid are used interchangeably.) (c) A wide variety of "fair share" tuition plans has been devised by entrepreneurial schools so that children from lower-income families are not excluded because of inability to pay. "Fair share" means, in one case, that higher-income parents pay tuition closer to the actual cost per pupil of running the school, while lower-income parents pay proportionately less. (d) The school's leaders, including teachers and parents, do not sit back waiting for other parents to arrive with their children but instead recruit aggressively. They promptly reach out to new populations entering the neighborhood. After all, cities like Chicago are demographically dynamic, not static.

8. Private schools have enjoyed amazing success in recruiting part-time volunteers. A study by the National Catholic Educational Association, "Catholic High Schools and Their Finances 1990," reported that, on the average, parent

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

or family volunteers each donated 27 hours during the academic year. A similar situation exists among elementary schools.

The next step may be the recruitment of full-time volunteers. In Chicago, dozens of college graduates are teaching or working in private elementary schools, as part of a church-sponsored volunteer program to which they have made a commitment of one or more years. Lutherans, Catholics, and Mennonites are among groups with volunteer teachers working in Chicago schools. These programs include Amate House, Apostolic Volunteers, Claretian Volunteers, Inner-City Teaching Corps, Jesuit Volunteer Corps, Lutheran Volunteers Corps, and Mennonite Voluntary Service. (4) In a city like Chicago, these volunteers often live together in a residential community from which they go forth each day to their prearranged jobs. Two national directories are available: "Connections: A Directory of Lay Opportunities" and "The Response: Lay Volunteer/Missioner Opportunities." (5)

9. Experienced leaders of non-public schools are in a realistic position to appraise the usefulness of technical assistance from outside providers. When school officials realize that they do not have the expertise, many go searching for it. For some schools, working with outside consultants can become a time-consuming and unnecessary exercise. But for other schools, providers such as those listed here can offer, for a short or longer period of time, professional advice or training in administration, finance, marketing, board development, fund-raising, public relations, and institutional development. They also offer workshops and seminars. In most cases, the provider requires a minimum but modest charge. A telephone call, in most cases, will determine whether any of the following not-for-profit providers listed below can be of service.

- The Alternative Schools Network supplies technical assistance to existing private schools and to persons interested in starting a school. The Network's priority goes to "alternative schools." (6)

- The Volunteer Network recruits and trains volunteers who then are matched with not-for-profit organizations, including non-public schools, to participate in their programs, to offer technical assistance, and to serve on boards or committees. (7)

- The Executive Service Corps recruits retired executives as volunteers who offer their special skills to assist not-for-profit organizations, including private schools, to solve operational and managerial problems. (8)

- The Support Center of Chicago provides confidential consultation services to not-for-profit organizations, including schools, through the use of trained volunteers in fiscal management, board development, marketing, public relations, management audits, or other areas. (9)

- The Donors Forum of Chicago provides technical assistance workshops on research for funding and proposal writing, information about foundations and corporate contributors, and a library of U. S. foundations, fund-raising and philanthropy. It also publishes the Directory of Illinois Foundations which profiles 493 Illinois foundations, identifies corporate foundations with matching gift programs, and lists foundations which make grants to elementary and secondary education. (10)

• The Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs publishes "Proposal Writing: A Basic Primer" designed to help not-for-profit groups write applications for grants from the public and private sectors. (11)

* * *

Having put its own house in order, a non-public school is then in an advantageous position to cultivate and absorb funds from other sources and to seek out government programs for which students in non-public schools are eligible.

III. Cultivating Other Private Resources

A non-public educational institution situated in one of Chicago's inner-city neighborhoods or low-income suburbs need not stand alone. It is not an island surrounded by public indifference. Around and beyond the school is an urban community, each year becoming more interested in, and more concerned about, the school's future and the educational opportunity it offers. Chicago's citizenry and civic leadership increasingly recognize the importance of the neighborhood private school to its community's vitality and to the city's welfare as a whole. Parents prize a neighborhood private school where their children can study and learn.

The 1991 "Quality of Life" survey by the Metropolitan Chicago Information Center showed that, for Chicago households with children, school quality is an important reason for moving. When adults with school-age children were asked whether they are thinking of moving in the next two years, 51 percent said "yes" (26 percent to another neighborhood in the city and 25 percent to the suburbs or somewhere outside the metropolitan area). Those thinking of moving were asked why. Forty-two percent expressed their desire to be in a nicer neighborhood; 30 percent, in a safer neighborhood; and 13 percent, in an area with better schools. Suburban residents with school-age children were asked, "Why did you move to your present neighborhood?" Thirty-four percent wanted a nicer home; 12 percent said the move was prompted by a job change; and 13 percent sought an area with better schools. (1)

These parental anxieties do not go unnoticed. Community leaders, including retailers, restaurant owners, professionals (doctors, dentists, lawyers, pharmacists, or accountants), barbers, tailors, insurance agents, beauticians, and others become alarmed when they watch their neighborhood's stability threatened by an exodus of parents in search of better schools. Such a departure of loyal customers and clients foreshadows commercial decline and business failures. Unfortunately, private schools frequently overlook these community sources of support. Taking advantage of recent government initiatives on behalf of "school reform," many public schools have already succeeded in tapping this neighborhood interest in education by obtaining money and services from the private sector. *

The rising concern in neighborhoods about the financial soundness of their local private schools often goes untapped; it begs to be cultivated by the sponsors of non-public schools.

A survey by Inc. magazine found that the six top reasons why small business owners make contributions to not-for-profit institutions (including private schools) were:

- They wanted to become involved in the community (96 percent);
- They considered the donation to be good public relations (76 percent);
- They were personally asked by a friend or colleague to make the donation (64 percent);
- They knew the organization (53 percent);

---

* See Appendix B: "How to get money, service for your school." Catalyst, "an independent publication created to document, analyze and support school improvement efforts in Chicago's public schools," published this article to encourage local public schools to seek "outside help."

- They had made previous contributions to the organization (53 percent);

- The donation was tax deductible (34 percent). (2)

Nationally, and locally in Chicago, a re-awakening of concern for the fate of private, inner-city schools is evident. This resurgence of interest goes beyond such prestigious, independent schools as Francis W. Parker School, Latin School of Chicago, Chicago City Day School, and others; it now also centers on the well-being of private neighborhood schools, most of them with a religious affiliation. As evidenced by their response to the annual Big Shoulders campaign, for example, civic leaders and public officials have finally begun to appreciate how vital these schools are to the survival and well-being of the city itself. They now regard these schools as an urban reservoir, a precious alternative to a troubled public school that fails to educate its graduates for the urban mainstream. And last, but not least, public officials and civic leaders better understand the perilous condition of these private schools and the probability that these valuable community resources may disappear because of civic neglect. In explaining why his foundation made a $300,000 grant to the Big Shoulders Fund, Craig E. Kennedy, former president of the Chicago-based Joyce Foundation, said:

> There is some concern that we're detracting from our commitment to a strong and effective school system. But you can go into the toughest neighborhoods in Chicago, step inside a Catholic school, and you'll see that kids are learning. (2a)

What then are the indicators of this renewed interest in the survival and expansion of urban private schools in neighborhoods beset by poverty and municipal frustration, such as those overwhelmed by the presence of giant, high-rise public housing projects? The finest indicators of this mounting interest are the new resources now available, locally and nationally, to non-public schools. Twelve such indicators deserve notice:

- Non-public elementary and secondary schools have been featured in Forbes, Teacher Magazine, Time, New Republic, U. S. News & World Report, Reader's Digest, Wall Street Journal, N. Y. Times, Washington Post, Chicago Tribune, Chicago Defender, Washington Times, Chicago Magazine, Crain's Chicago Business, and other publications. Thus the public's awareness of the presence of these schools has been heightened, and its concern for their future has been strengthened. Because so many of the private schools concentrated in large urban areas are under Catholic sponsorship, they receive the lion's share of media attention. In Chicago, 70 percent of the private school students attend Catholic educational institutions, many of which are situated in the city's lowest-income neighborhoods and serve children of many faiths. At the same time, however, the important role of Lutheran, Evangelical, and other Christian schools in the city neighborhoods also gains recognition.

- The United Way of Chicago, through its "Venture Grants," has begun to appreciate the importance of private schools as an alternative for children who are "educationally disadvantaged" in Chicago's public schools. The United Way's Needs Assessment Committee for Human Capital Development in 1991 issued a report, "Assessing Chicago's Human Needs," which found:

> . . . one overarching cause of educational disadvantage in the City of Chicago: The organizational structure and focus of the Chicago public schools system do not allow it to meet current human capital needs. . . . There is an uneven availability of alternatives to and within the Chicago public school system. Alternatives

> range from efforts to improve local schools, seeking entrance at elite public high schools, enrolling in special vocational programs, or leaving the public school system entirely for home education, alternative schools, or parochial and other private schools.
>
> Strategic responses: Equalize access to alternatives; expand choice options; and develop equitable financial support. Opportunity for nonprofit intervention: Improve information about alternatives, especially for low-income groups. (3)

To follow through on this needs assessment, the United Way of Chicago launched its "Venture Grants" program which offers cash incentives to not-for-profit institutions that give priority to the educationally disadvantaged. The target populations are children from low-income families, immigrants, non-English speaking adults and youth, refugees, and people with disabilities. These priority grants, awarded annually, range from $5,000 to $40,000 and are given for "innovative service responses and projects" or for "collaborative efforts of two or more organizations." Private schools are eligible.

- Parents who teach in public schools have become a significant source of student enrollment for non-public schools. Not to be underestimated is the ringing endorsement given by public school teachers themselves to the private school as an educational alternative to a local public school. In six large U. S. cities (Albany, Atlanta, Memphis, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle), 25 percent of the public school teachers, on the average, enroll their children in private schools. (4) In Chicago, 46 percent of the public school teachers who live in the city sent one or more of their children to private elementary or secondary schools, most under religious sponsorship. (5) In Milwaukee, according to Wisconsin state legislator Polly Williams, 60 percent of the city's public school teachers enroll their children in private schools. (6)

- A visible shift is underway in corporate and foundation giving. Corporations and foundations, historically dedicated to the support of colleges and universities only, have been adding elementary and secondary schools, private and public, to their priority list. This newer diversification was first noted in 1984 by the Wall Street Journal:

> Secondary schools get more help from corporate donors. Corporations and their foundations, already significant in college fund-raising, increasingly give to secondary schools (and sometimes even elementary schools) as well. (7)

Nationally, the Council for Aid to Education (New York), the Foundation Center (New York), the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel Trust for Philanthropy (New York), the Council for American Private Education (Washington), and the Council on Foundations (Washington) have all reported increased giving to elementary and secondary education, both private and public. (8) According to Sheppard Ranbom, a consultant to the ITT Educational Services Corporation:

> Corporate financial donations for K-12 education have more than doubled since 1986, compared to a 17 percent increase in overall corporate giving, according to the Council for Aid to Education. Last year [1990], corporate gifts to all levels of education totaled $1.4 billion, $64 million of which went to pre-collegiate education, the Council estimates. (9)

Hayden Smith of Yale University's Program on Non-Profit Organizations, predicts that the next decade will probably see a steady growth in corporate support for pre-college education, both in terms of total dollars and as a

percentage of total giving. The reason, Smith explains, is that education efforts promise a "demonstrable benefit" to the corporate giver:

> I personally believe there's no such thing as altruism in corporate giving; they have to perceive a corporate benefit. Corporations are not in the business of giving money away; they're not foundations. . . . [Since there's] a growing corporate apprehension about the quality of K-12 education in this country . . . they're putting major money where their mouth is. Suddenly, it is the thing to do. (10)

From coast to coast the surge of corporate involvement, through funding and volunteers for public school reform, has not diminished the interest in private schools. Why? Many of their best workers are graduates of these schools. Furthermore, having experienced the inflexibility of public school establishments, many corporate executives now have heightened respect for the contribution of neighborhood private schools, especially since some timetables for public school reform are no longer projected in years but in decades.

• New corporate initiatives are reflected in their financing of scholarships for elementary and secondary students in non-public schools. In Indianapolis, the Golden Rule Insurance Company, with support from Eli Lilly & Co. and other companies, established the Educational CHOICE Charitable Trust. Some 750 youngsters from lower-income families now receive "half tuition vouchers" (up to $800) to attend a private elementary school of their choice. Their choices have been Baptist, Christian, Lutheran, Seventh Day Adventist, and Catholic schools. J. Patrick Rooney, Chairman of the Golden Rule Insurance Company, views private vouchers as a new idea in education reform:

> [W]ith private vouchers, we made a real and practical investment in the future of our business as well as our society. Every business and charitable organization should start its own voucher program, for one or one thousand students it doesn't matter. What does <u>matter</u> is they will have taken a step toward helping others as well as themselves. (11)

In Newark, a former partner of Wesray Capital Corp. set up a program known as READY (Rigorous Education Assistance for Deserving Youth). READY pays for the education and mentoring of 550 children from Newark's low-income families, beginning in first grade and continuing through high school. Approximately half of the children are enrolled in Catholic parochial schools—as many as these schools can handle—and half in public schools. In addition, "exceptionally bright and deserving students" who eventually graduate from high school are offered college scholarships. (11a)

In New York City, a Student/Sponsor Partnership, organized in 1986 by a Wall Street investment banker and his friends, gives eighth-grade students in the public schools the opportunity to attend one of thirteen private high schools (Catholic or Lutheran) for four years. The 500 students who have entered the program to date were academically average or marginal, came predominantly from single-parent families (the majority on welfare), and were headed for public high schools where more than 50 percent of the students drop out before graduation. All or part of the tuition ($2,000 on the average) is paid by the sponsor who agrees to be the student's mentor, calling the student every month, and visiting her or him at least four times a year. Of the 101 students who have been graduated thus far, 90 percent are in college. (12) Similar programs under corporate sponsorship have not yet appeared in Chicago.

• The growing appreciation by some business executives of the value of non-public schools can be seen in their endorsement of parental choice. In Indiana, Commit Inc., a coalition of business leaders who represent Cummins Engine

Co., Eli Lilly & Co., Inland Steel Co., and the Lincoln National Corp., unsuccessfully asked the state legislature in 1991 to change state law to provide parents with vouchers so that they could send their children to the school of their choice, public or private, within the district. In California, ExCEL (Excellence Through Choice in Education League) is spearheaded by the chief executive officer of the Whittaker Corporation, a Los Angeles-based aerospace supplier. ExCEL sought to put on the 1992 ballot a California-wide initiative by which state-funded "scholarships" would follow low-income students to either public or private schools. Such initiatives by top business leaders in Illinois have yet to surface.

• The financial backbone for several multi-million dollar campaigns to rescue inner-city Catholic schools has come from business leaders, foundation executives, doctors, lawyers, and others. In New York City, the Partnership for Quality Education seeks to raise $100 million by 1995 to "save" 140 inner-city Catholic schools, emphasizing block grants to schools as tuition supplements to keep down the costs of student tuition. In Philadelphia, the "Catholic Life 2000" campaign expects to raise $100 million by 1996, with a major portion of the money earmarked for Catholic schools. In Chicago, the Big Shoulders Fund, formed in 1986 to aid 130 inner-city Catholic schools, raised $25 million by 1991 and then upped the goal to $50 million. In St. Louis, the "Today and Tomorrow Campaign—today's pupils are tomorrow's leaders"—was organized in 1990 to encourage the area's major corporations to invest in Catholic schools. To date, Anheuser-Busch has given $2 million for a five-year program to upgrade the achievement of 900 public and private school students in reading, math, and study skills. The Monsanto Fund granted $2 million for a ten-year program to establish science education programs in St. Louis' Catholic elementary and junior high schools. In the Chicago area, three Lutheran high schools (Walther, Luther North, and Luther South) are collaborating in a "Securing the Future" campaign to raise $1.5 million per school by 1994, as part of a larger drive to generate more than $10 million to make the schools solvent. (13)

• In response to national and local findings about pupil underachievement and impending teacher shortages, corporate executives are sponsoring new educational programs. What is significant about these new educational projects is that they target teachers, students, and administrators in both public and private schools. Typical of these corporate initiatives in Chicago is the Golden Apple Foundation. A non-profit entity, it has been successful in enlisting the funding support of the Illinois State Board of Education, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Chicago Department of Human Services, and the Mayor's Office of Employment and Training. The foundation works to enhance the public's respect for teaching, to attract highly qualified young people to the profession, and to reward teachers for outstanding classroom performance. Each year the foundation gives Golden Apple awards to ten outstanding teachers in the Chicago area. Winners receive a $2,500 stipend plus a fall-term sabbatical to study tuition-free at Northwestern University, and the personal use of an IBM computer. Recipients also are honored at a special awards broadcast on WTTW/Channel 11. The foundation also sponsors the Golden Apple Scholars Program for high school seniors who receive nine years of assistance, college scholarships, mentoring, and paid summer internships in exchange for a five-year commitment to teach in public or private schools located in low-income areas. (14)

• The push for scholarships, in all probability, is the single, most promising development among neighborhood-based private schools. As school leaders seek funds for student financial aid, they have been pleased at the positive response to such solicitations. Such earmarked grants produce a double benefit by adding to the enrollment and defraying operating expenses. In most inner-city neighborhoods increased tuition fees produce empty classrooms. To keep tuition low and enrollment high, successful schools raise money for scholarships and financial aid. Time and again, potential donors have indicated that they prefer personalized giving, especially if a student comes from a highly visible poverty area such as a public housing project.

In inner-city neighborhoods tuition fees rarely, if ever, cover school expenditures. Consequently, in campaigns to multiply scholarships and increase financial aid, benefactors are often asked to provide the school with a grant equal to the actual operating cost per student. Consider, for example, an elementary school where the actual cost is $1,800 per student. If the announced tuition is $1,000 and if the scholarship awarded the student is worth is $500, the donor is asked for a gift of $1,300 to make up the difference between the $500 paid by the parent and $1,800 cost per student.

A school's fund-raising and organizational strategy—to multiply scholarships to elementary and secondary schools—is not an original or revolutionary idea. College scholarships to attract the best high school graduates and financial aid to enroll students from not-so-wealthy families are frequently used and highly popular pathways into higher education. The funding sources for such programs are both private and public. The student beneficiaries of the state-funded Illinois Student Assistance Commission may attend the college of their choice, whether it is operated as an institution of government or sponsored by a private body, such as a church group. (15)

The movement to expand student financial aid is making more significant progress in private high schools, where tuition costs are much higher than in elementary schools. The National Catholic Educational Association reported that in the 1989-90 school year 17 percent of the students enrolled in the nation's Catholic high schools received some financial assistance, compared to 10 percent in 1985-86. The average grant towards tuition rose from $500 in 1985-86 to $880 in 1989-90. Private elementary schools, however, lag behind in providing financial aid. Instead, they have focused on keeping tuition costs as low as possible. (16)

At the elementary and secondary level, many non-public schools have already set up scholarship funds to aid parents who cannot afford the tuition. As a result, some schools can claim, like St. Therese School in Chicago's Chinatown, that no student is rejected because of an inability to pay the tuition. (17) Under its "No kid can't come" tradition. St. Ignatius College Prep reports that it awarded students about $400,000 last year in work/study, low-cost loans, and direct grants. (18) The Chicago Province of the Christian Brothers sponsors an "Adopt-A-Student Program" for Chicago's "financially disadvantaged minority students" so that they can attend St. Patrick High School, DeLaSalle Institute, St. Joseph High School, Montini High School, or Driscoll High School, all in the Chicago area. Last year 314 young women and men were adopted as students. About 25 percent of all students enrolled in the five schools receive some form of financial assistance. (19) The Chicago Province of the Society of Jesus sponsors the Arrupe Scholarship Program so that minority students and others may attend the four Jesuit high schools in Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Chicago, and Wilmette. Now in its seventh year, the program has educated more than 300 students who have then gone on to study at universities such as Georgetown, Harvard, Loyola, Notre Dame, and Stanford. (18) (20) The Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago has a policy that no children are ever turned away from a Jewish day school because their parents cannot afford the tuition. (21)

Officials of well-organized elementary schools actively involve themselves in the transition of their graduates to private high schools. They seek out opportunities for scholarships and financial aid so that their students will enroll in high schools that carry on the educational tradition of the grade school. Such placement activities are considered to be an integral part of the elementary school's mission. Thus, a growing enrollment in such elementary schools can increase the number of applicants for private secondary schools.

- Supporting the new financial strategy for multiplying student scholarships and increasing financial aid has been the arrival of "third party" funds and programs which are sponsored by others than the schools themselves. The

majority of these "third party" givers provide high school scholarships to eighth-grade graduates. The Big Sisters of Chicago, for example, grant partial scholarships to Catholic girls' high schools. (22) Midtown Educational Foundation "helps inner-city youth enter into private, college preparatory schools." (23) The Daniel Murphy Scholarship Foundation provides a four-year private high school education to academically qualified, economically disadvantaged eighth graders at one of eight non-public secondary schools in the Chicago area. Students are offered a summer work program with caddy positions at golf clubs to augment their scholarship aid and to enable them to qualify for a Chick Evans College Scholarship. (24) Link Unlimited helps young blacks from Chicago's inner city to obtain the best possible high school education. Begun in 1966, Link Unlimited has sponsored more than 600 students through high school. More than 300 Link high school graduates now attend college or have graduated. Adults or couples, black or white, who sponsor a scholarship maintain close contact with the student throughout the school year and help in obtaining a summer job. (25) CYCLE, an acronym for Community Youth Creative Learning Experience, an "outreach youth ministry" spun off from LaSalle Street Church, sponsors various scholarship programs for youngsters who come from the Cabrini-Green public housing project. CYCLE's high schoolers receive scholarships to attend Holy Trinity, Josephinum, Francis W. Parker, Hales Franciscan, St. Scholastica, Latin School of Chicago, or St. Joseph high schools. (26) Some "third party givers" do provide grants, however, for elementary school scholarships:

- The Andrew M. Greeley Foundation makes grants for scholarships to Catholic grammar schools serving a majority of "non-Caucasian" students. (27)

- The Big Shoulders Fund awards scholarship grants to elementary and secondary students in Chicago's inner-city Catholic schools. (28)

- Under a "Bright Knights" Program, Providence-St. Mel School offers scholarships to fifth and sixth grade boys and girls from needy families. The program, underwritten by McDonald's Corporation, REFCO, and Heller Financial Company, provides daily transportation, after-school tutoring, and summer field trips. (29)

- The Urban Non-Public Education Fund aids "parochial, Protestant or independent schools" through in-kind gifts and services, outright gifts of cash, and referrals of "businesses or friends." (30)

- As schools expand their scholarship activity and undertake other types of fund-raising, they give greater attention to matching gift programs. These employer-sponsored programs match employee gifts to not-for-profit organizations. Instead of top executives making all the decisions about where corporate contributions should go, many more companies each year will also follow their employees' community involvement. Some of the nationally known Chicago businesses that double—or even triple—employee gifts include: IBM, Baxter, Citicorp, Chicago Tribune, Sara Lee, Quaker Oats, Kraft Foods, and Leo Burnett. The national clearinghouse for matching gift programs is CASE, the Council for Advancement and Support of Education. It now identifies more than 1,000 U. S. companies and institutions that double employee donations. (The most popular recipients of such matching gifts to date have been colleges and universities. In the 1990-91 year, for example, the University of Notre Dame received $2.5 million from corporations to match nearly 7,300 individual gifts.) CASE publishes lists of companies that match employee gifts to elementary and secondary schools, hospitals, community organizations, and cultural institutions. (31)

Vigilant givers and receivers can thus double the dollars of a school gift. For example, St. Joseph elementary school annually receives $2,500 for its scholarship program from a supporter who works for Salomon Bros., which then matches

that gift with another $2,500. Using CASE resources and their own local contacts, a wide range of non-profit institutions in the Chicago area compiles individual lists. Among them are such schools as Madonna and St. Scholastica high schools and such other not-for-profit institutions as Glenbrook Hospital, WTTW, Rainbows for All God's Children, Ravinia Festival, Mercy Home for Boys and Girls, and Deborah's Place. In a variation, the Lutheran Brotherhood, a fraternal benefit society, sponsors two programs: Primary Partners, which matches a member's gift of $25 to $100 to Lutheran schools and day care centers, and LIFT, which does the same for Lutheran high schools. (32) Some companies go beyond matching employee gifts by also promoting volunteerism. As encouragement to community involvement, some corporations follow the lead of their workers by making an annual gift to the institution or school where their workers serve on a board or committee. Others match their workers' volunteered time at not-for-profit institutions with proportionate donations.

• Not mentioned above are the Chicago foundations that make grants to the private secondary and elementary schools themselves, such as the Helen Brach Foundation, Coleman Foundation, Lloyd A. Fry Foundation, Dr. Scholl Foundation, Chicago Community Trust, Polk Brothers Foundation, Illinois Humane Society, Greater North Michigan Avenue Association Foundation, and many others. The Foundation Guide for Religious Grant Seekers, produced by FADICA (Foundations and Donors Interested in Catholic Activities), lists U. S. foundations that "help religious organizations (Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish) locate foundations that might likely fund their projects or programs." In 1990 FADICA published How to Save the Catholic Inner-City School, proceedings of a national symposium. (33) In 1991 the National Society of Diocesan Foundations was organized to "serve the needs of archdiocesan foundations throughout the country." (34) Many of these foundations seek new resources for parish schools. The Finance Council Forum is published quarterly for members of Catholic parish finance councils and offers "a summary of news briefs relating to financial matters of parishes, schools . . . ." (35) And Robert Rogalski, principal of a Lutheran elementary school, is the author of Pathways to Amazing School Success in Development and Funding. (36)

The editor of Foundation Guide for Religious Grant Seekers offers some sound advice for grant seekers, including those from private schools:

> Is a Foundation grant really what is needed or wanted? Not only is a foundation grant hard to get but it can, in some cases, be counter-productive. What may be needed might not be foundation support, but better support from an organization's own constituency since its long-term financial well-being lies there, not with foundations. To the extent that the prospect of foundation support distracts one from that realization, genuine harm is done. Finally, the Guide may help an applicant realize that foundations have a rather limited place and role in private philanthropy in general and in religious philanthropy in particular. (33)

IV. Government Aid: A 'Mixed Bag'

A varied but limited menu of government-funded resources is currently available to students in non-public schools in Illinois. Most of these services, whether funded from Washington or Springfield, are funneled through the Illinois State Board of Education and/or a local public school district, such as the Chicago Public Schools (Chicago School District #299). Access to these government-funded resources is not always easy. Bureaucratic reluctance, however, has been overcome by vigilant parents and private school personnel who know how to demand their fair share of what the law authorizes.

Over the last 25 years the U. S. Congress, with growing concern, has taken steps to ensure that more federally funded education programs benefit all students, whether enrolled in a private or public school. Insisting on equal protection under the law, Congressional leaders are making sure that students are not treated as second-class citizens if their parents choose to enroll them in a private school. At the state level, however, vestiges of a deep-rooted prejudice against religious schools persist. (In Massachusetts, for example, parochial school students until recently were required to pay a fee to be admitted to public facilities, such as parks and zoos, while students in public schools entered free of charge. That practice was changed early in 1991. But then in November 1991, the Boston School Committee, as a budget-cutting maneuver, took away free bus passes from non-public school students in grades seven through 12 but kept them for public school students.)

Federally funded programs are available in all 50 states and are usually allocated by state boards of education and local public school districts. Most federal funding stems from Chapters 1 and 2 and Titles II and V of the U. S. Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These funds support, for instance, remedial education, computer software, government surplus property, library books, math and science education, breakfast and lunch programs, and bilingual education.

However, the range of <u>state-funded</u> services to which non-public school students are entitled varies widely from state to state and may include one or more of the following: parental reimbursement for school transportation, loans of textbooks and workbooks, health services, special education opportunities, and testing. In New Jersey, for example, non-public school students are also entitled to basic nursing services, such as medical examinations, dental screenings, hearing tests, maintenance of health records, and emergency health care. Unlike some other states, the State of Illinois does not use state funds to provide private schools with items such as audio-visual materials and equipment, computer software material, school supplies, tuition tax deductions, funding for state-mandated services, guidance and counseling, school nurses, or funds for educating public school dropouts or those at risk of dropping out. Therefore, it is federal funding only that comes, via the Illinois State Board of Education, to assist non-public schools with any of the above programs or the cost of services and materials. (1)

On the other hand, Illinois does fund two programs for college scholarships that provide up to $5,000 a year to Illinois high school students who pledge to teach in an Illinois elementary or secondary school, whether public or private. Their purpose is to increase the supply of qualified teachers. The first is the Paul Douglas Teacher Scholarship Program whose recipients promise to teach full-time at a public or non-public school for two years for every year of scholarship assistance. The second is a minority scholarship program, through which a black or Hispanic student receives a college scholarship after promising to teach, for as many years as the years of scholarship aid, in a "public, private or parochial school" whose student enrollment is at least thirty percent "minority." (2)

Are children in non-public schools receiving their fair share of existing government services and funding? The answer is a "mixed bag." Conditions differ from state to state. Students in Illinois private schools, for example, do not receive many of the benefits that other states provide their non-public school students. That is why Peter Li, Inc., publisher of Today's Catholic Teacher, began distributing a 12-page report, "Get Your Fair Share of Educational Funding." (1) Based on a 50-state survey, the 1991 report summarizes the basic and latest information concerning federal and state educational programs intended to benefit all students. Some states have legislated only a handful of resources for private schools. Other states have provided many more. From this report one can easily identify those resources that other states provide by law for private school students but which are denied them in Illinois, e.g., reimbursement for mandated services, tuition tax deductions, nursing services, school supplies, or audio-visual equipment.

Not only are there differences among the states as to what each provides by law for non-public schools, but attitudes and accountability towards non-public schools also vary significantly from state to state. In principle, all information about government-funded services, such as textbooks, bus transportation reimbursement, computer software, et cetera, should be as easy to obtain as an auto license. Some public school officials, at the local and state levels, are cooperative and go out of their way to supply the information requested. But in practice, citizen access to such information is frequently stymied. Many public school officials display little interest in the well-being of private schools. Why? The three key factors are: bureaucratic inertia, outright hostility, and an uneasiness with competition. As watchdogs for public school bureaucracies, these officials frequently have to be cajoled or pressed into furnishing a complete and satisfactory answer. Unsympathetic to private schools, these government officials reluctantly share precise and appropriate information.

The current information gap can be bridged, in part, by organizations representing private schools. But for smaller, inner-city private schools without such representation, the communication barriers are more unyielding and often impossible to overcome. Experience demonstrates that independent or religious schools that enjoy a well-staffed, central office (Lutheran or Catholic, for example) can, over a period of time, establish a collaborative relationship with a district office for public schools. The non-public school professional who comes to understand how the public school bureaucracy functions can negotiate more successfully on behalf of private schools—individually or collectively. Without skilled guidance, however, a lone school board member or the principal of a small inner-city private school with a lean staff proceeds with an unfair disadvantage.

The unsteady flow of information from public school officials to private schools reflects a deeper malaise that afflicts large, public school bureaucracies. After spending a half day searching for such information and after being shunted from one government office to another, the former principal of a Chicago private school reacted as follows:

> You need to be a Sherlock Holmes to find out. Question follows question: Who is it that knows what government resources are channeled, via the Chicago Public Schools, to non-public school students? How can these resources be obtained with a minimum of paper shuffling? And when do you really know that you actually have, in hand, information about all the services to which you, as a taxpayer, are entitled? Information is seldom volunteered. You keep nagging to get it. After a while, you are made to feel privileged that such information was even given you.

Because a separate office usually administers each government service, it is easy to lose an inquiring parent or school principal in a bureaucratic maze of referrals from one office to another. Information about reimbursement for transportation, for example, is in one office; information about school lunch programs can only be found in another

office. Five to ten different offices may have to be contacted to assemble the necessary information. Even after numerous calls or visits have been made, persistent inquirers often discover that the information they gathered is still partial and inadequate. Furthermore, public school officials seldom go out of their way to publicize the funds and services to which children in private schools are entitled by law. *

Another insight into the uncooperative relationship between the public and non-profit sectors of education was offered by Professor Kirsten A. Gronbjerg of Loyola University Chicago. After examining the educational scene in Chicago, she concluded:

> In education. . .the amount of public funding going to non-profit organizations is quite small, especially compared to the volume of public spending in these fields. The competition that now exists between the public and non-profit sectors of education is closely linked to scarce resources. . . . [T]he emergence of a vast public bureaucracy and related infrastructure has created a set of vested interests, able to counteract those of the non-profit sector. (3)

Further evidence supporting Professor Gronbjerg's finding is contained in All Our Children Can Make the Grade, a report published by Voices for Illinois Children. Assessing the Illinois state-funded pre-school program for children at risk of academic failure, the report concluded:

> The legislation permits school districts to subcontract their pre-school programs, including educational programs, to private schools or not-for-profit organizations. . . . Equal access to pre-school programs is a serious issue in Chicago. . . . The Board's traditional refusal to subcontract educational programs to qualified not-for-profits (one is subcontracted this fiscal year [1989-90], combines with the shortage of space and overcrowding in particular areas of the city to deny some children access to pre-school. . . . 14 out of the 20 community areas in Chicago with the greatest need for additional pre-school places have overcrowded schools. (4)

In recent years, small but significant steps have been taken by non-government institutions to improve communications between public and private educators. This occurs, for example, when a staffed network of private schools in a metropolis, such as the Office of Catholic Education of the Archdiocese of Chicago, assigns one or more professionals as liaison to local public school district officials, members of the Illinois State Board of Education, members of Congress, state legislators, and other public officials. When such professionals begin to specialize, they are then able to identify—and obtain—those government resources also targeted for students in non-public educational institutions.

Other private initiatives have been organized in Chicago to deal with the local public school bureaucracies. The Illinois Affiliation of Private Schools for Exceptional Children seeks to provide exceptional children an opportunity for freedom of education choice. (5) The Coordinating Council for Handicapped Children (6) helps parents and professionals obtain special education rights for disabled youngsters enrolled in public and private schools. Access Living (7) is a center for service and advocacy on behalf of people with disabilities. One of its priorities is to gain for disabled children and youth the same quality of education that is given to non-disabled students. Designs for Change, a public interest group for school

---

* See Appendix A. The Illinois State Board of Education was asked for information only about its programs and resources and not about those that might be available to students in private schools, for example, from the Illinois Department of Energy and Natural Resources (about the Statewide School Weatherization Program) or the Illinois Secretary of State and State Librarian (about library programs).

reform, filed suit in federal court in 1991 on behalf of the parents of 10,000 children who benefit from special education programs. The suit charged that the Chicago Board of Education had made huge cuts in such programs, despite an earlier pledge that it would prevent such cuts. (8) The Alternative Schools Network, a coalition of community-based, non-profit schools and other educational agencies serving Chicago's inner-city neighborhood, provides a second chance for students who fail to adapt to the public school system. The network enunciates three goals:

- Resource development—to assist programs individually and as a group to develop the various resources required to survive and thrive.

- Information sharing/technical assistance and training—to build more support and cooperation among various programs across the city and to provide a wide range of ways of meeting the various program and management needs of the ASN member organizations.

- Advocacy—to impact and shape public and private policy in the areas of education, employment, social services, and other areas as they relate to and affect inner-city residents and programs. (9)

Throughout Illinois, the State Board of Education works with the Illinois Advisory Committee on Non-Public Schools which meets regularly to review the State's educational priorities and activities and publishes an informative newsletter monthly. The following groups collaborate through the Illinois Advisory Committee: Ad Hoc Committee for Illinois Home Education, Alternative Schools Network, Archdiocese of Chicago Office of Catholic Education, Associated Talmud Torahs of Chicago, Association of Christian Schools International, Board of Jewish Education, Christian Schools International, Christian Schools of Illinois, Diocese of Joliet Catholic School Office, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Illinois Association of Christian Schools, Illinois Montessori Society, Independent Schools Association of Central States, Independent Schools of Greater Chicago, Lutheran Schools Missouri Synod, Seventh Day Adventist Illinois Conference, Seventh Day Adventist Lake Region Conference, and Solomon Schechter Day Schools. (10)

The Catholic Conference of Illinois, the public policy arm of the state's six Catholic bishops, monitors legislation before the Illinois General Assembly in Springfield. On its staff, there is a specialist in education matters, legislative and administrative, which affect the state's private schools. (11)

What initiatives, on the other hand, have been taken by other governmental bodies to bridge the communication gap? The New York State Education Department, for instance, publishes a "Handbook on Services to Pupils Attending Nonpublic Schools" and a "Manual for New Administrators of Nonpublic Schools" (12) to introduce them to federal and state sources of support. Similarly, the New Jersey Department of Education publishes "A Directory of State and Federal Programs for Nonpublic School Students." (13) However, the staff at the Illinois State Board of Education which once issued a similar publication, now out-of-date and out-of-print, indicated that it had no intention of producing an updated version. (14)

On the Horizon

Other government initiatives on behalf of students (preschool, kindergarten, and grades one through twelve) are already in the works or are being proposed and discussed. Some are in place and need only implementation:

• For the fiscal year 1992-93, the City of Chicago's Department of Human Services will be seeking additional community-based, not-for-profit organizations (including private, inner-city schools) to sponsor Head Start programs for low-income children, ages three to five. (15)

• As the lead agency in Illinois, the State's Department of Children and Family Services will distribute the new federal Child Care and Development Block Grant monies directly to the providers of day care or to parents in the form of vouchers. (16) First priority goes to children from families with low and modest incomes and to children with special needs. (17)

• A newly expanded "Earned Income Tax Credit" provides, for example, that families with children and with an adjusted gross income of less than $21,250 in 1991 qualify for a credit on their federal income tax payment. The new maximum tax credit for a one-child family, depending on various circumstances, is $1,978. If the family has earned income but pays no income tax, the tax credit is paid directly to the wage earner. Some proponents of the tax credit see it as a way for low-income, wage-earning parents to help pay for child care or tuition in a private school. (17) (18) In inner-city neighborhoods, some private schools have begun programs to assist parents who may be eligible for the earned income tax credit but have not filed the necessary Internal Revenue Service forms. It is hoped that such a realized tax credit would then be converted by low-income parents into a tuition payment. The Internal Revenue Service estimated that in 1991 two million families eligible for this credit failed to claim it and that two million more are eligible in 1992 for the first time. An estimated 50,000 Illinois families eligible for an average credit of $700 do not claim it. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities in Washington will send a free "Fact Pack" to businesses, service agencies, and schools that come in contact with the working poor. (19)

Other proposals for new government initiatives that would enhance the ability of parents to send their child to the school of their choice are still in the discussion stage. Some of these are:

• The U. S. Department of Education, through its office for private education, is updating a Handbook of Federal Support for Private Schools that acquaints private schools with the federal programs serving non-public school students, including those for which a non-public school can compete. The revised handbook will help ensure that federally-funded services are provided in an equitable manner to eligible children in non-public schools. (20)

• Voices for Illinois Children is actively supporting state legislation which would give families who qualify for the federal "Earned Income Tax Credit" a "Children in Poverty Tax Credit" on their state income tax. The Illinois income tax credit would be in the amount of five percent of the federal income tax credit. (21)

• Over the years, it has been suggested that the Illinois State Board of Education establish a "one-stop service center" in its Chicago office. Here representatives of private schools, as well as public school officials, could obtain information about the availability of all state, federal, and other resources and the steps that must be taken to qualify for them. At such a center, inquiries could be answered expeditiously and fully and applications processed with a minimum of red tape. Furthermore, an annual informational workshop sponsored by the Illinois State Board of Education for representatives of non-public schools would be extremely helpful in sharing information and speeding up the application procedure. In addition, such a workshop would identify those programs and resources (state and federal) for which non-public schools can compete with their public school counterparts. Will the Illinois Advisory Committee on Non-Public Schools add the idea of such a "one-stop service center" to its agenda when it meets with the Illinois State Board of Education? (10) (14)

• City, state, and federal officials who were preoccupied with public school reform in the 1980s are now taking a second look at private schools. Democratic mayors of the nation's largest cities have in the past been silent about, or opposed to, funding parental choice in education. But now impatient with the snail's pace of public school "reform," some mayors are taking a second look at ways to ensure parental choice among public and private schools. With a government-funded voucher, low-income parents would have a choice of schools for children who are not receiving the education they deserve from the local public school to which they are assigned. Such a voucher program has been called a "G.I. Bill for Kids." In 1991 Boston's Mayor Raymond L. Flynn was asked: "Are you at the point where you are supporting vouchers?" His response was:

> I haven't in the past, but I'm more inclined to look at it more closely than ever before. And that's because the school bureaucracy is unresponsive to the parents and the school children. The kids can't wait longer . . . . If public schools don't get on the ball, you're going to see more and more people moving toward school vouchers to provide some competition for failing public schools in our country.

In his inaugural address in 1991, Chicago's Mayor Richard M. Daley suggested that school vouchers might finally be the way to shake up the public school bureaucracy:

> With each passing year, thousands more young Chicagoans are doomed to a life of ignorance and failure. Many are not being equipped with the skills and training they need to win and hold the jobs of the future. They are being warehoused and forgotten, often in schools that are crumbling. So the call for new money to sustain what many see as the same old system will not fly.
>
> The people of Chicago are frustrated. The [Illinois] General Assembly is skeptical. The pace of reform is too slow. The school bureaucracy still stands in the way of change, rather than leading it. And the current financial crisis threatens to trigger another round of doubt and finger-pointing . . . .
>
> Some cities are experimenting with even more dramatic ideas, such as voucher programs, to upgrade their schools. And if we can't break the stronghold of bureaucracy and School Board politics in Chicago, we may have to take that next step.

In a magazine article published by the Wisconsin Policy Research Institute in 1992, Mayor John O. Norquist of Milwaukee wrote:

> I believe the whole system is the problem . . . . The system today ignores parental preferences about where their children should attend school and how they should be educated . . . . I think it should ultimately be . . . replaced with new system—essentially a voucher or choice system.
>
> We should give city parents the purchasing power they need to enroll their children in any public or private, non-sectarian school that complies with essential standards. Schools that fail to keep kids in schools, or teach them well, will either go out of business—teachers, principal, administrators, and all—or change their ways. (22)

For the sake of educational excellence and equity, school choice is a live issue in the Illinois General Assembly, as it is in other state legislatures. In Illinois public support is emerging for educational vouchers, tax credits, or tax deductions

for parents so that they can afford to send their children only to the public or private school of their choice. Three sets of parents would benefit: First, parents who desire to send their children only to a public school and who are displeased with the school to which their child is assigned would be able to select another public school which, they are convinced, will better respond to their child's unique talents. Secondly, parents who prefer to send their children only to a private school would not be put at a disadvantage because of poverty. (In other words, poor families would be able to do for their children what wealthy parents now do: pick the best schools for their youngsters.) Finally, parents who want the option of sending their child to the public or private school that best meets their child's educational needs would not only have a choice of public schools but would also not be deterred from a private school because of low income. (23)

There is a growing recognition that private, inner-city schools perform a public service. In November 1991, President George Bush was widely quoted when he called for a fundamental redefinition of "public schools," saying: "[W]hether a school is organized by privately financed educators or town councils or religious orders or denominations, any school that serves the public and is held accountable by the public authority provides public education." Speaking of his America 2000 Plan for education, Bush said: "A key tenet . . . is for parents to choose their children's schools. We won't have full confidence, full choice in education until the dollar follows the scholar. And that's how it works in federal aid programs for college students; you know that. We don't exclude students who choose private schools, including religious schools . . . . we can encourage creative competition among public, private and parochial schools . . . . This will improve education for everyone." (24)

V. Looking Ahead

This report was intended to encourage those Chicagoans who toil each day to improve the survival rate of non-public schools or to start new ones in inner-city neighborhoods. Looking ahead to the remaining years of this century, some further questions remain to be posed, explored, and answered.

- What can be done to make the relationship between public and non-public schools less adversarial and more cooperative? It is clear that the state's children would benefit most of all; but so would Illinois taxpayers if money and services were distributed fairly and without time-consuming bureaucratic reluctance. Collaborative programs, for example, can be multiplied. In Evanston, for example, a special reading program located at a public school is open to students from private and public schools.

- What are the implications, for non-public schools, of plans by the Chicago Board of Education to institutionalize and expand fund-raising activities aimed at the private sector? As part of the push for school reform, members of the board of education, school officials in the central and district offices, principals and local school councils have each succeeded in generating private dollars for public schools. These contributions have come from foundations, businesses, and other groups. Through its non-profit fund-raising arm, Friends of Ray, the Ray Public School in the Hyde Park community, successfully collected more than $50,000 from private donors to buy advanced equipment for a science lab and for other projects. (1) During the decade of the 1990s, for example, an estimated $200 million will be spent by corporations and foundations to fund and support efforts at reform of the Chicago Public Schools, according to a 1992 survey conducted by the Institute of Urban Life.

- How can cooperation among non-public school leaders be enhanced? Currently, such collaboration is shaky, intermittent, and seldom given high priority. Private schools have yet to learn how to do everything together except what they need to do separately. Educational ecumenism remains a road less traveled, especially when it comes to influencing the established bureaucracies at the state and district levels. Furthermore, the experiences, activities, and programs, now confined to one denominational group, could be shared in the best of ecumenical traditions.

- What more can be done to increase public awareness of the diversity among private schools? The National Center for Educational Statistics recently issued a report describing and categorizing the universe of private schools. Grouping non-public schools into three categories (Catholic, other religious, and non-sectarian), the Center further subdivided them into three additional groups: Catholic, parochial, diocesan, and private; other religious, affiliated with a Conservative Christian school association, affiliated with national denomination or other religious school association, and unaffiliated; non-sectarian, regular programs, special emphasis, and special education. (2)

- What non-financial incentives can be given to Chicago-area colleges and universities to devote more attention to the curriculum, teaching, administration, philosophies, and well-being of non-public education? Only a handful of institutions of higher education, Rosary College and Concordia University, for example, have taken major steps in this direction. But most schools or departments of education in the Chicago area continue to be oriented to graduating teachers and administrators for the public school system.

- As Chicago's civic and business leaders each year come to realize more and more the importance of the neighborhood-based, non-public school to its local community's vitality and to the city s welfare as whole, how can this

new interest be channeled in practical ways that will bolster non-public schools in low-income communities? The initiative for building effective partnerships rests with the leadership of non-public schools. But skepticism about the value of such partnerships abounds. Skeptics point to the highly publicized efforts of many boards of education to persuade businesses "to adopt a public school." Such "adoptions," however, have often been turned into public relations stunts without any meaningful partnerships.

To avoid taking such an educational detour, business and school leaders can use a guide, "Building Effective Partnerships," produced by Apple Computer. The guide describes how individual schools have developed bona fide partnerships with businesses and community groups via apprenticeships, mentoring programs, scholarships for at-risk youth, equipment for financially strapped schools, professional symposia that revitalize teachers, and other ways. A copy of the 36-page guide can be obtained from Today's Catholic Teacher. (3)

Public responses to these six questions will further guarantee the staying power of non-public schools in inner-city neighborhoods and will enable such schools to continue mainstreaming the urban poor.

Notes and Sources

Part I: Mainstreaming the Urban Poor

(1) Reclaiming the Inner City by Ed Marciniak, National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs, Box 20, Cardinal Station, Washington, DC 20064. (202) 319-5128.

(2) See various studies by Professors James S. Coleman and Andrew M. Greeley of the University of Chicago and Professor Donald Erickson of the University of California Los Angeles.

(3) Big Shoulders Fund, Archdiocese of Chicago, Box 1979, Chicago, IL 60690. (312) 751-8337.

(4) CASBA's current president is John Chandler, St. Ignatius College Preparatory School, 1076 West Roosevelt Road, Chicago, IL 60608. (312) 421-5900.

The ADC's current president is Diana Kozojed, Mother Guerin High School, 8001 West Belmont Avenue, River Grove, IL 60171. (312) 625-3278 or (708) 453-6233.

The current convener of the Northwest Side Recruiters is Karen Brown, Madonna High School, 6055 West Belmont Avenue, Chicago, IL 60641. (312) 282-2552.

Part II: Enabling a Non-Public School's Future: Indicators of Viability

(1) Urban Linkage Coordinator, Department of Mission and Ministry, Northern Illinois District, Lutheran Church Missouri Synod, 230 South Wolf Road, Hillside, IL 60162. (708) 449-3020.

Mission Partners, Division for Outreach, Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, 8765 West Higgins Road, Chicago, IL 60631. (312) 380-2661.

Sharing Program, Office of the Ministry of Peace and Justice, Archdiocese of Chicago, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, IL 60611. (312) 751-8390.

Big Shoulders Fund, Archdiocese of Chicago, Box 1979, Chicago, IL 60690. (312) 751-8337.

Insuring Our Future: A Report on Jewish Education in Chicago, a 1991 report of the Commission on Jewish Education of the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago, One South Franklin Street, Chicago, IL 60606. (312) 346-6700.

(2) Time (May 27, 1991), p. 48.

(3) "The Catholic Elementary School Extension Program" and "U. S. Catholic Elementary and Secondary Schools: 1990-91", National Catholic Educational Association, 1077 Thirtieth Street, N. W., Suite 100, Washington, DC 20007. (202) 337-6232.

(4) Amate House, 2100 West 116th Place, Chicago, IL 60643. (312) 881-7774.

Apostolic Volunteers, 932 North Kostner Avenue, Chicago, IL 60651. (312) 342-1072.

Claretian Volunteers, 205 West Monroe Street, Chicago, IL 60606. (312) 236-7846.

Inner-City Teaching Corps, 123 North Wacker Drive, Suite 1190, Chicago, IL 60606. (312) 871-1245.

Jesuit Volunteer Corps (Midwest), P. O. Box 32696, Detroit, MI 48232. (313) 894-1140.

Lutheran Volunteer Corps, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, 8765 West Higgins Road, Chicago, IL 60631. (312) 380-2661.

Mennonite Voluntary Service, 722 Main Street, Box 347, Newton, KS 67114. (316) 283-5100.

(5) St. Vincent Pallotti Center for Apostolic Development, 715 Monroe Street, N. E., Washington, DC 20017. (202) 529-3330.

International Liaison of Lay Volunteers in Mission, 4121 Harewood Road, N.E., Washington, DC 20017. (202) 529-1100 or (800) 543-5046.

(6) Alternative Schools Network, 1807 West Sunnyside Avenue, Chicago, IL 60640. (312) 728-3335.

(7) Volunteer Network, 300 West Washington Street, Chicago, IL 60606. (312) 606-8240.

(8) Executive Service Corps, Client Development, 25 East Washington Street, Chicago, IL 60602. (312) 580-1840.

(9) Support Center of Chicago, 166 West Washington Street, Chicago, IL 60602. (312) 606-1530.

(10) Donors Forum of Chicago, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60604. (312) 431-0264.

(11) Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, Office of Urban Assistance, 620 East Adams Street, Springfield, IL 62701. (217) 785-6193.

Part III: Cultivating Private Resources

(1) Metropolitan Chicago Information Center, 104 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 300, Chicago, IL 60603. (312) 580-2878.

(2) Inc., 38 Commercial Wharf, Boston, MA 02110. (617) 248-8000. Percentages add up to more than 100 percent because of multiple responses.

(2a) As cited in Chicago's Private Elementary and Secondary Schools: Enrollment Trends, published by the Institute of Urban Life, One East Superior Street, Chicago, IL 60611. (312) 787-7525.

(3) "Assessing Chicago's Human Needs" and "Venture Grants Program," United Way of Chicago, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, IL 60601. (312) 580-2800.

(4) "Facts about Private Schools as Background for the Debate on Private Choice," Council for American Private Education, 1726 M Street N.W., Suite 1102, Washington, DC 20036. (202) 659-0016.

(5) "Confidence Crisis: Public Teachers Pick Private Schools for Own Kids," Chicago Reporter (May 1984), Community Renewal Society, 332 South Michigan Avenue, Room 500, Chicago, IL 60604. (312) 427-4830.

(6) "Schools of Choice," Pittsburgh Catholic (December 21, 1990), 100 Wood Street, Suite 500, Pittsburgh, PA 15222. (412) 471-1252.

(7) Wall Street Journal (March 27, 1984), p. 1.

(8) Council for Aid to Education, 51 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10010. (212) 689-2400.

Foundation Center, 79 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10003. (212) 620-4230.

American Association for Fund-Raising Counsel's Trust for Philanthropy, 25 West 43rd Street, Suite 1519, New York, NY 10036. (212) 354-5799.

Council for American Private Education, 1726 M Street N.W., Suite 1102, Washington, DC 20036. (202) 659-0016.

Council on Foundations, 1826 L Street N.W., Washington, DC 20036. (202) 466-6512.

(9) "The Business and Education Partnership" by Sheppard Ranbom, in a special advertising section of the New Yorker (12/23/91), sponsored by ITT Educational Services, 3500 DePauw Boulevard, Indianapolis, IN 40268. (317) 873-7160.

(10) As quoted in Business Ethics (March/April, 1992), 1107 Hazeltine Blvd., Suite 530, Chaska, MN 55318. (612) 448-8864.

(11) The Educational CHOICE Charitable Trust, 7440 Woodland Drive, Indianapolis, IN 46278.

(11a) READY Foundation, 240 Dr. Martin Luther King Boulevard, Newark, NJ 07102.

(12) Student/Sponsor Partnership, 24 East 38th Street, New York, NY 10016. (212) 545-0341.

(13) Lutheran High School Association of Greater Chicago, 333 West Lake Street, Addison, IL 60101. (708) 628-6289.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(14) Golden Apple Foundation, 8 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60603. (312) 407-0006.

(15) Illinois Student Assistance Commission, State of Illinois Center, 100 West Randolph Street, Suite 3-200, Chicago, IL 60601. (312) 814-3745.

(16) National Catholic Educational Association, Department of Secondary Schools, 1077 Thirtieth Street N.W., Suite 100, Washington, DC 20007. (202) 337-6232.

(17) St. Therese School, 251 West 23rd Street, Chicago, IL 60616. (312) 326-2837.

(18) St. Ignatius College Prep, 1076 West Roosevelt Road, Chicago, IL 60608. (312) 421-5900.

(19) Christian Brothers, 200 DeLaSalle Drive, Romeoville, IL 60441. (312) 242-1240.

(20) Loyola Academy, 1100 North Laramie Avenue, Wilmette, IL 60091. (708) 256-1100.

(21) Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago, One South Franklin Street, Chicago, IL 60606. (312) 346-6700.

(22) Big Sisters, 203 North Wabash Avenue, Room 1307, Chicago, IL 60601. (312) 346-0075.

(23) Midtown Educational Foundation, 718 South Loomis Street, Chicago, IL 60607. (312) 733-1016.

(24) Daniel Murphy Scholarship Foundation, 440 South LaSalle Street, Suite 2828, Chicago, IL 60605. (312) 663-8231.

(25) Link Unlimited, 7759 South Eberhart Avenue, Chicago, IL 60619. (312) 487-5465.

(26) CYCLE, 1441 North Cleveland Avenue, Chicago, IL 60610. (312) 664-0895.

(27) Andrew M. Greeley Foundation, P. O. Box 1079, Park Ridge, IL 60068.

(28) Big Shoulders Fund, Archdiocese of Chicago, Box 1979, Chicago, IL 60690. (312) 751-8337.

(29) Providence St. Mel High School, 199 South Central Park Avenue, Chicago, IL 60624. (312) 722-4600.

(30) Urban Non-Public Education Fund, 2261 Indiana Avenue, Lansing, IL 60438. (708) 474-0515.

(31) Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), 11 Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036. (202) 328-5900.

(32) Lutheran Brotherhood, 625 Fourth Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55415. (612) 340-7700.

(33) FADICA , 1350 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Suite 303, Washington, DC 20036. (202) 223-3550.
Both books can be obtained from the Scholars Press, P. O. Box 6996, Alpharetta, GA 30239. (800) 437-6992.

(34) National Society of Diocesan Foundations, 88 East Broad Street, Suite 1180, Columbus, OH 43215. (614) 461-1311.

(35) Finance Council Forum, Pascit Publications, P. O. Box 1125, Traverse City, MI 49685. (616) 929-7227.

(36) Center for Lutheran School Development, Box 2422, Sun City, AZ 85372. (608) 843-2057.

Part IV: Government Aid: A 'Mixed Bag'

(1) "Get Your Fair Share of Educational Funding," Today's Catholic Teacher, Peter Li, Inc., 2451 East River Road, Dayton, OH 45439. (513) 294-5785.

(2) Illinois Student Assistance Commission, State of Illinois Center, 100 West Randolph Street, Suite 3-200, Chicago, IL 60601. (312) 814-3745.

(3) "Patterns of Institutional Relations in the Welfare State: Public Mandates and the Nonprofit Sector" by Kirsten A. Gronbjerg, Journal of Voluntary Action Research (January-June 1987).

(4) Voices for Illinois Children, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 515, Chicago, IL 60604. (312) 427-4080. Since the publication of All Our Children Can Make the Grade, the Chicago Board of Education has subcontracted with a few additional not-for-profit organizations.

(5) Illinois Affiliation of Private Schools for Exceptional Children, Ada S. McKinley Community Services, 725 South Wells Street, Chicago, IL 60607. (312) 554-2331.

(6) Coordinating Council for Handicapped Children, 20 East Jackson Boulevard, Room 900, Chicago, IL 60604. (312) 939-3513.

(7) Access Living, 310 South Peoria Street, Suite 201, Chicago, IL 60607. (312) 226-5900.

(8) Designs for Change, 220 South State Street, Suite 1900, Chicago, IL 60604. (312) 922-0317.

(9) Alternative Schools Network, 1807 West Sunnyside Avenue, Chicago, IL 60640. (312) 728-4030.

(10) Illinois Advisory Committee on Non-Public Schools, 2261 Indiana Avenue, Lansing, IL 60438. (708) 474-0515. The groups that work with the Illinois Advisory Committee are:

Ad Hoc Committee for Illinois Home Education, 1400 North Mason Street, Chicago, IL 60651. (312) 889-7608.

Alternative Schools Network, 1807 West Sunnyside Avenue, Chicago, IL 60640. (312) 728-4030.

Archdiocese of Chicago, Office of Catholic Education, 155 East Superior Street, Chicago, IL 60611. (312) 751-5243.

Associated Talmud Torahs of Chicago, 2828 West Pratt Boulevard, Chicago, IL 60645. (312) 973-2828.

Association of Christian Schools International, 950 Northbrook Avenue, Northbrook, IL 60062. (708) 564-2252.

Board of Jewish Education, 618 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60605. (312) 427-5570.

Christian Schools International, District III, 2261 Indiana Avenue, Lansing, IL 60438. (708) 474-0515.

Christian Schools of Illinois, 316 North Sycamore Street, Genoa, IL 60135. (815) 784-2616.

Diocese of Joliet, Catholic School Office, 425 Summit, Joliet, IL 60435. (815) 727-4674.

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Division for Education, 8765 West Higgins Road, Chicago, IL 60631. (312) 380-2850.

Illinois Association of Christian Schools, 200 North Roselle Road, Schaumburg, IL 60194. (708) 885-3230.

Illinois Montessori Society, 1985 Pfingsten Road, Northbrook, IL 60062. (708) 498-1105.

Independent Schools Association of Central States, 1400 West Maple Avenue, Downers Grove,IL 60515. (708) 971-3581.

Independent Schools Association of Greater Chicago, 1234 Madison Park, Chicago, IL 60615. (312) 538-4986.

Lutheran Church Missouri Synod, Northern Illinois District, Office of Christian Education, 2301 South Wolf Road, Hillside, IL 60162. (708) 449-3020.

Seventh Day Adventists, Illinois Conference, Education Department, 3721 Prairie Avenue, Brookfield, IL 60513. (708) 485-1200.

Seventh Day Adventists, Lake Region Conference, Education Department, 8517 South State Street, Chicago, IL 60619. (312) 846-2661.

Solomon Schechter Day Schools, 350 Lee Road, Northbrook, IL 60062. (708) 498-2100.

Other school groups in the Chicago area are:

Episcopal Diocese of Chicago, Education for Mission and Ministry, 65 East Huron Street, Chicago, IL 60611. (312) 787-6410.

Greek Orthodox Diocese of Chicago, Greek Education, 40 East Burton Place, Chicago, IL 60610. (312) 337-4130.

Lutheran High School Association of Greater Chicago, 333 West Lake Street, Addison, IL 60101. (708) 628-6289.

Pre-School Owners Association of Illinois, 7250 West Touhy Avenue, Chicago, IL 60648. (312) 631-3633.

(11) Catholic Conference of Illinois, 200 Broadway, Springfield, IL 62701. (217) 528-7214.

(12) New York State Education Department, 111 Education Building, 89 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12234. (518) 474-5844.

(13) New Jersey Department of Education, 225 West State Street, Trenton, NJ 08625. (609) 984-7814.

(14) Illinois State Board of Education, 100 North First Street, Springfield, IL 62702. (217) 782-2221; 100 West Randolph Street, 14th floor, Chicago, IL 60601. (312) 814-2220.

(15) Chicago Department of Human Services, Office of Children's Services, 500 North Peshtigo Court, Chicago, IL 60611. (312) 744-4045.

(16) Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, Office of Child Development,1020 South Wabash Avenue, 7th floor, Chicago, IL 60605. (312) 793-8607.

(17) Day Care Action Council of Illinois, 4753 North Broadway, Suite 726, Chicago, IL 60640. (312) 561-7900.

(18) Internal Revenue Service—Outreach, 230 South Dearborn Street, Room 706, Chicago, IL 60604. (312) 886-4669, 4609, or 7802.

(19) Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 777 North Capital Street N.E., Suite 705, Washington, DC 20002. (202) 408-1080.

(20) U. S. Department of Education, Office of the Secretary/Private Education, Room 1105, Federal Office Building 6, 400 Maryland Avenue S.W., Washington, DC 20202. (202) 401-1376.

(21) Voices for Illinois Children, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 515, Chicago, IL 60604. (312) 427-4080.

(22) WI: Wisconsin Interest (Winter/Spring 1992), Wisconsin Public Policy Research Institute, 3107 North Shepard Avenue, Milwaukee, WI 53211. (414) 963-0600.

(23) Educational Choice: A Catalyst for School Reform, a report of the Task Force on Education of the City Club of Chicago, 151 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, IL 60601. (312) 565-6500.

(24) As quoted in Policy Watch, a newsletter of Teach America, 151 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 2003, Chicago, IL 60601. (312) 861-0180.

V. Looking Ahead

(1) "Board fund-raising plan stirs suspicions" by Scott Schraff, in Catalyst: Voices of Chicago School Reform (April 1992), Community Renewal Society, 332 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60604. (312) 427-6130.

(2) Diversity of Private Schools, National Center for Educational Statistics, U. S. Department of Education, 555 New Jersey Avenue N.W., Washington, DC 20208. (202) 219-1754.

(3) "Building Effective Partnerships," a special supplement in Today's Catholic Teacher (March 1992), 2451 East River Road, Dayton, OH 45439. (513) 294-5785.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A: Illinois State Board of Education

Serving urban communities

Institute of Urban Life

1 East Superior
Chicago, Illinois 60611
312.787.7525

December 19, 1991

Robert Leininger
State Superintendent of Education
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777-0001

Dear Superintendent Leininger,

For a school report which I am currently completing and which is being funded by the Lloyd A. Fry Foundation of Chicago, I would appreciate someone in your office providing me with the following information.

In your publication, State, Local and Federal Financing for Illinois Public Schools, 1990-91, there is a summary of state funding (pp.47-49) which identifies nearly 100 various program categories. Leaving aside those program categories earmarked specifically for public schools, for example, general state aid or for the State Board of Education and its staff and functions, I would appreciate the following information:

(1) Which of these programs is available to non-public school students, teachers, administrators and/or to the non-public schools themselves?

(2) For those programs that are available, which office in the Springfield State Board of Education (please include telephone number) can provide further information? In Chicago?

(3) If there are State Board of Education services, programs and/or funds which are not included in the summary of state funding noted above, would you indicate which ones they are and which are available to non-public school students, teachers, administrators and/or to the schools themselves?

Thank you for your attention to this request. And best wishes for the holiday season.

Sincerely yours,

Ed Marciniak

Ed Marciniak
President

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

100 North First Street • Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001

Louis Mervis
Chairman
217/782-2098

Robert Leininger
State Superintendent

January 2, 1992

Mr. Ed Marciniak, President
Institute of Urban Life
1 East Superior
Chicago, IL 60611

Dear Mr. Marciniak:

Your letter of December 19, 1991, has been referred to me for response.

Some of the state-funded programs referred to in State, Local and Federal Financing for Illinois Public Schools, 1990-1991 are available to non-public school students. The page references shown in parentheses after each program area below are for that publication.

- Pupil Transportation. Section 29-4 of the School Code (copy enclosed) provides for the transportation of pupils attending other than a public school. (pp. 28-30)

- Parent or Guardian Transportation Reimbursement. Section 29-5.2 of the School Code (copy enclosed) provides for the reimbursement of the parent or guardian of a pupil for transportation costs where specific conditions exist. (p. 30)

- Driver Education. Sections 27-23 and 27-24.2 of the School Code (copy enclosed) require that driver education courses "shall be open to a resident or non-resident pupil attending a non-public school in the district wherein the course is offered..." (p. 31)

- Food Services. Paragraphs 712.1 through 712.9 of the School Code (copy enclosed) provide that private schools may provide school lunch program and free breakfast and lunch programs and receive reimbursement from the State if certain conditions are met. (p. 36)

- Textbook Loan Program. Section 18-7 of the School Code provides for the loan of secular textbooks free of charge to any student enrolled in grades kindergarten through 12 at a public or non-public school which is in compliance with the State's compulsory attendance laws and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. (pp. 43-44)

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

- Prevention Initiative Pilot Programs for At Risk Infants and Toddlers and their Families. Section 2-3.79 of the School Code provides for four pilot programs to provide prevention services to at-risk children, under the age of three, and their families to better prepare them for a successful school experience. (p. 34)

Questions regarding Pupil Transportation, Parent or Guardian Transportation Reimbursement, and Driver Education should be directed to the Reimbursements Section, Department of School Finance, telephone 217/782-3482.

Questions regarding the Food Services Program should be directed to the Department of Child Nutrition, telephone 800/545-7892 or 217/782-2491.

Questions regarding the Textbook Loan Program should be directed to the Instructional Improvement Section, School Improvement Services Department, telephone 217/782-9374.

Questions regarding the Prevention Initiative Pilot Programs should be directed to the Department of Special Education, telephone 217/782-6601.

Sincerely yours,

Gary Ey
Assistant Superintendent
Department of Education

LA FI\094MI506

Serving urban communities

Institute of Urban Life

1 East Superior
Chicago, Illinois 60611
312 787 7525

January 29, 1992

Gary Ey
Assistant Superintendent
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777-0001

Dear Mr. Ey:

Thank you for your early response to my letter of December 19, 1991 to State Superintendent Robert Leininger. I appreciate the information and references you provided.

After sharing your letter of January 2, 1992 with my associates who are helping prepare our school report, several questions were raised about other programs that might be available to non-public students:

(1) What about Early Childhood Education Programs for pre-kindergarten children at risk of academic failure? (State, Local and Federal Financing for Illinois Public Schools, 1990-91, p. 36)

(2) What about the Center for Scientific Literacy? (p. 45) Does the legislation permit contracts with private schools or other not-for-profit organizations?

(3) What about Adult Education initiatives for persons sixteen years of age and older who have not completed their secondary education, etc.? (pp. 31-32) Does the legislation permit contracts with private schools or not-for-profit organizations?

(4) What about Summer Food Service programs? (p. 36) Does the legislation permit contracts with non-public schools or not-for-profit organizations?

(5) What about Truants' Alternative and Optional Education Programs? (p. 40) Does the legislation permit contracts with private schools or other not-for-profit organizations?

(6) What about special education programs? (pp. 32-34) Besides tuition for handicapped pupils attending private schools, are any of the other programs listed on these pages available by law for non-public students?

Are there any other State Board of Education services, programs and/or funds which have not been noted above or in our previous correspondence but which are available to non-public students, teachers, administrators and/or the schools themselves? For any of the above programs which are available, which office in the State Board of Education (please include telephone number) can provide further information?

Finally, is there a single office in the State Board of Education which will provide the necessary information about which programs available to non-public school students? Or does each office have to contacted separately?

Thank you for your attention to this request. And please convey my thanks also to State Superintendent of Education Robert Leininger for the prompt attention given to my 12/19/91 letter to him. I enclose a copy of your 1/2/92 letter for reference.

Sincerely yours,

Ed Marciniak

Ed Marciniak
President

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

100 North First Street • Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001

Louis Mervis
Chairman

Robert Leininger
State Superintendent

February 4, 1992

Mr. Ed Marciniak, President
Institute of Urban Life
1 East Superior
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Mr. Marciniak:

In response to your request of January 29, 1992, questions about the following programs should be directed to the Department or Section indicated:

(1) Early Childhood Education: Barbara J. Howery, Early Childhood Education Section 217/524-4835.

(2) Center for Scientific Literacy: Lynne Haeffeley, Department of School Improvement Services, 217/782-0322.

(3) Adult Education Initiatives: Noreen, S. Lopez, Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, 217/782-3370.

(4) Summer Food Service Program: Patricia A. Thornton, Department of Child Nutrition, 217/782-2491.

(5) Truant's Alternative and Optional Education Programs: Jean Lewis, Intervention and Improvement Services Section, 217/782-5035.

(6) Special Education Programs: Jerry Whitworth, Department of Special Education 217/782-6601.

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

Mr. Ed Marciniak
February 4, 1992
Page 2

One purpose of the publication State, Local and Federal Financing for Illinois Public Schools is to provide information as to whom to contact for information on specific programs. There are far too many state and federal programs for a single office to have all the necessary information available on each program. Each office will have to be contacted separately.

Sincerely,

Gary V. Ey
Assistant Superintendent
Department of School Finance

Serving urban communities

Institute of Urban Life

1 East Superior
Chicago, Illinois 60611
312 787 7525

February 19, 1992

Gary V. Ey
Assistant Superintendent
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777

Dear Mr. Ey,

Thank you for your letter of February 4, 1992 responding to mine of January 29, 1992. My original request to the State Superintendent Robert Leininger, referred to you for response, and my subsequent request of you do not seem to us as complicated as you indicate.

My associates and I are simply seeking information about which Illinois State of Education programs might be available to non-public students. We are well aware, as you indicate in your February 4, 1992 letter, that the State Board of Education oversees a great many programs. Hence the letter to the State Superintendent.

Your letter of February 4, 1992 notes that "There are far too many state and federal programs for a single office to have all the necessary information on each program." My letter to you of January 29th was not seeking "all the necessary information" about each program. It only asked a very simple question about the six programs: Were any of the six--or others--available to non-public students? I now, respectfully, renew that request.

If your office is the inappropriate one to answer my question, would you suggest that I write the State Superintendent directly? My associates and I do appreciate the attention you have given our request.

Sincerely yours,

Ed Marciniak
President

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

100 North First Street • Springfield, Illinois 62777-0001

Louis Mervis
Chairman

Robert Leininger
State Superintendent

March 11, 1992

Mr. Ed Marciniak, President
Institute of Urban Life
1 East Superior
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Mr. Marciniak:

In response to your letter of February 19, 1992, the following information is provided for the six program areas requested:

(1) Early Childhood Education--Funds are only available to public school districts. Public school districts may (with prior approval of the State Superintendent of Education) subcontract with private schools, not-for-profit organizations, or other governmental agencies to implement the programs.

(2) Center for Scientific Literacy--Funds cannot be allocated to private schools. Funds may be allocated to not-for-profit organizations devoted to scientific literacy.

(3) Adult Education Initiatives--Beginning with the current federal fiscal year, federal funds may be allocated to not-for-profit organizations for this purpose. State funds, however, are still limited to public school districts and public community colleges.

(4) Summer Food Service Program--Some not-for-profit organizations may qualify for funding. The Department of Child Nutrition must be contacted directly by any such interested organization to determine its eligibility. Any such not-for-profit organization food service programs cannot supplant existing programs.

(5) Truant's Alternative and Optional Education Programs--Private schools or not-for-profit organizations may only be involved as sub-contractors through public school districts, regional superintendents of schools, or public community colleges.

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

(6) Special Education Programs--Special education programs are only available to students enrolled in public schools.

Additional, detailed information should be requested from the departments or sections indicated in my letter of February 4, 1992.

Sincerely,

Gary N. Ey
Assistant Superintendent
Department of School Finance

cc: Barbara Howery
Lynne Haeffele
Noreen S. Lopez
Patricia A. Thornton
Jean Lewis
Jerry Whitworth

FI\007BC506w

How to get money, services for your school

by Susan Klonsky

In a city the size of Chicago—with a dozen major universities, hundreds of foundations and thousands of business and financial institutions—schools have barely scratched the surface of outside help. But obtaining such help takes school initiative and planning. Here are some pointers:

■ **THINK DEVELOPMENT.** Candy and bake sales are fine for immediate needs—repairing and replacing broken equipment, for example—but long-term educational change requires long-term fund raising. LSCs should gather members of the school staff and community, including local businesses, into a development group. Some schools, including Norwood Park Elementary, 5900 N. Nina, and Alcott Elementary, 2625 N. Orchard, have set up not-for-profit organizations to work on community relations and fund raising.

■ **THINK VISION.** Presenting a clear picture of how you want your school or class to change is the key to winning foundation grants, which range from small sums for individual teachers to multi-year f nding for schoolwide planning and restructuring. (Don't expect any money for building repairs, ordinary supplies and maintenance or other routine expenses that public dollars should support.)

Some schools write themselves off, reasoning that their test scores are too low or too high for foundations to be interested. But decisions about funding are made largely upon the extent to which a school has a common well-articulated vision for change.

■ **THINK NETWORKING.** Schools can enhance their chances of obtaining grants by linking up with other schools or community groups to craft joint projects.

■ **DEVELOP SPECIALISTS.** Select one or two members of the school community or staff to receive training in proposal writing. One way to spot such talent is to request teachers to write proposals describing their ideal classroom improvement projects and then submit the best ones to a foundation that makes teacher grants.

The Board of Education used to provide free training on proposal-writing through the Department of Grants and Technical Assistance. But the board recently closed the program to help balance its budget. The Donors Forum, an association of foundations, offers two-day courses on proposal writing. The next one will be held Nov. 13-14. The fee is $150 per person. For reservations, call the Donors Forum Library (312) 431-0265.

■ **VISIT DONORS FORUM LIBRARY.** Located at 53 W. Jackson, Chicago's library of philanthropy is open free to the public. It offers information about foundations, the programs they support and proposal deadlines. A helpful staff points visitors to useful reference guides.

■ **CONSULT YOUR SCHOOL LIBRARY.** The sixth volume of the Leadership Learning Library, a set of videotapes and guides published and sent to all schools last spring by Leadership for Quality Education and the Citywide Coalition for School Reform, walks LSCs through the grant-seeking process. It is called "Hidden Community Resources." For more information, call LQE at (312) 592-6532.

■ **TAP INTO THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY.** Several business groups aim to draw schools and businesses closer together. They offer direct assistance, typically "consulting" from volunteers, and referrals. Such groups include Leadership for Quality Education (312) 592-6532, the Executive Service Corps (312) 580-1840 and Volunteer Network (312) 606-8240.

The Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry offers business connections and pre-employment programs for elementary and high schools, but it reports that fewer than a fourth of Chicago schools have made use of its services. For more information, call (312) 580-6945.

■ **GET ADOPTED.** More than 10 years after the "Adopt-A-School" program was launched in Chicago, a third of the schools remain "orphans."

It's time for schools to seek out businesses and other organizations and pull them into new partnerships. Here's how: Contact the president or community relations manager, preferably by letter, to request help with financial aid, goods and in-kind assistance. Arrange for a meeting. Invite business officials to visit your school: for an assembly, holiday event or open house, or to speak to students on career day.

Examples of such initiative include McDowell Elementary, 1419 E. 89th, which invited the 87th Street Business Association to an annual weekend retreat, and Garvy Elementary, 5225 N. Oak Park, which has joined the local Chamber of Commerce.

■ **TAP INTO THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY.** Since reform began, the largest reform-related foundation grants have gone to university education departments. By agreeing to become part of a research project or be a site for student teachers, schools may receive financial assistance, computer link-ups, consultation and staff development. Write the dean, noting staff members who are alumnae of the college. Capitalize on contacts with individual professors.

■ **BAND TOGETHER FOR POLITICAL ACTION.** While pursuing private money, don't ignore the need to work with other schools and organizations to protect public funding gains, such as state Chapter 1, and to demand fiscal accountability from the general superintendent, the Board of Education and the Illinois Legislature.

Susan Klonsky is a parent member of the Sayre Language Academy Local School Council and editor of Reform Watch, a school reform newsletter published by the Donors Forum.

Reprinted with permission from CATALYST (November, 1991).